

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed August 11, 2006. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification. Support for the language of Claims 1-29 can be found at page 9, lines 19-29; page 11, lines 9-15; and page 34, lines 1-7. It is disclosed therein that one or more render frames may be distributed by a schedule server to one or more render servers in one or more render hosts. Since samples of a render job may be provided prior to completion of the render job by a render server in a render host, those samples can clearly be individual frames. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-29 are in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet in view of Hancock, et al. Independent Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 recite in general an ability to provide one or more samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering of the first or second frames the first and second servers and receive an input from the client in response to the one or more samples. By contrast, as shown in col. 10, lines 34-37, of the Cajolet patent, the assisting computer completes its portion of the task and then returns its results to the problem dispatcher. There is no disclosure in the Cajolet patent that its assisting computer provides samples of rendered frames prior to completing its portion of the render job as required by the claimed invention. Thus, the Cajolet patent has no capability to provide one or more

samples of the rendered first or second frames for the render job to the client prior to completion of rendering the first or second frames by the first and second servers as required by the claimed invention. Moreover, the Hancock, et al. paper merely discloses providing a progressive view of the rendered image. The Hancock, et al. patent does not disclose any capability to receive an input from the client in response to the one or more samples as provided by the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-29 are patentably distinct from the proposed Cajolet - Hancock, et al. combination.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
062986.0186
(901.00)

PATENT APPLICATION
09/609,046

13

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments associated with this Application to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Charles S. Fish', is written over the printed name.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

November 13, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6447

Customer Number: 32764